DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 263 831 HE 018 876

AUTHOR Cardozier, V. R.
TITLE Recruiting and Selecting College Faculty. Higher Education Series, Topical Paper 8502.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Dept. of Educational Administration.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 31p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; Interpersonal Competence; Knowledge Level; *Personnel Policy; Productivity; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Teacher Dismissal; Teacher Motivation; *Teacher Recruitment; *Teacher Selection
IDENTIFIERS *New Colleges; *University of Texas Permian Basin

ABSTRACT

The process of recruiting and selecting college faculty at a new college, the University of Texas of the Permian Basin, is discussed. The university was established in September 1973 to serve students who would complete 2 years at community/junior colleges in the Permian Basin area. The school's mission and the two towns near the college are described (Odessa and Midland). Faculty were sought who had subject knowledge and enthusiasm for the discipline, enthusiasm for teaching, empathy for students, commitment to high academic standards, and the ability to get along with colleagues and administrators. Most of the faculty recruiting was done at leading research universities out of state. Personnel practices at the new university included: term tenure, student ratings of teachers each semester, linking salary increases and teaching performance, and an annual faculty award of $1,000 for outstanding teaching. Faculty evaluation committees and administrators terminated nontenured faculty as soon as it became apparent that they were not effective teachers or did not fit the institution, usually within 2 or 3 years instead of the maximum of 6 years. The institution's policy on research and publication is discussed, along with the relationship between the school and the community. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED263831

RECRUITING AND SELECTING COLLEGE FACULTY

V. R. Cardozier

Professor of Higher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

V. R. Cardozier

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE018 876

Topical Paper 8502

Higher Education Series

Departmental of Educational Adminstration

The University of Texas at Austin

1985

Preface

Virtually every dean and department chairman has at one time or another day-dreamed about starting his own college and having the privilege of choosing each faculty member. This is a report of the experience of one institution and its administration that had that privilege.

Most of the new colleges created during the 1960s and 1970s were community colleges. Most new universities grew out of teachers colleges or junior colleges. However, there were several dozen senior colleges and universities, each built totally as a new institution and, many of which instituted innovations of various kinds. Examples include Hampshire College in Massachusetts, Oakland University in Michigan, Evergreen State College in the State of Washington, SUNY College at Old Westbury, the University of California at Santa Cruz, the University of West Florida and Metropolitan State University in St. Paul, Minnesota.

One of the universities created de novo and with the intention of building into the design several innovations was the University of Texas of the Permian Basin, an institution that rose from the ground up on 640 acres of flat, barren terrain in West Texas. This paper deals with the plans, process and results experienced in the selection and appointment of faculty.

RECRUITING AND SELECTING COLLEGE FACULTY

A Case Study

The University of Texas of the Permian Basin (UTPB) was created by an act of the Texas Legislature in 1969, authorizing it to accept only junior and senior undergraduate students and to offer bachelors' and masters' degrees. It was designed to serve students who would complete two years at community/junior colleges in the Permian Basin area. Originally proposed to be called the University of Texas at Midland-Odessa, the name was changed belatedly as the bill worked its way through the legislature to recognize the Permian Basin, the geological formation in west Texas about which Midland and Odessa are centered. After the bill was signed, the University of Texas System Board of Regents, to which it had been assigned, decided to place the university in Odessa, 16 miles from Midland (the two towns are 20 miles apart).

In 1970, the President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Vice President for Business Affairs were appointed to begin planning the institution. The President who had been a professor as well as dean of engineering and who had special interest in academic matters worked closely with the Vice President for Academic Affairs, who was trained in and had taught higher education administration, in planning the academic components of the University. Some assistance was provided by the staff of the

University of Texas System but a change in most of the leadership in the UT-System administration during the first year plus the fact that three other UT-System campuses, all much larger and more complex, were being developed at the same time meant that UTPB administrators had considerable autonomy in their planning.

The planning, building and beginning of a new university, especially one that proposes to depart from the conventional, is a complex undertaking and involves thousands of decisions unless the planners automatically adopt conventional models of organization, administration, staffing, teaching and other functions. The planners of this institution examined virtually every question before deciding whether to adopt a conventional model or an innovative or less common model.

THE SETTING

When the planning staff arrived in Odessa in 1970, student riots and campus disruption in response to the bombing of the North Vietnamese in Cambodia was at its peak. There was no other senior college or university within 130 miles; the local junior college had been founded in 1946 and the values and attitudes of its faculty were much like those of the local populace, many of whom seemed to be most interested in ensuring that their new university did not hire radical faculty with long hair and beards like the ones they saw on the nightly news leading students riots, burning buildings and destroying property.

Midland and Odessa are located approximately half way between Dallas and El Paso on a semi-desert plateau at about 3,000 feet elevation. With an average annual rainfall of 13 inches, typical midday humidity of 20 percent and more than 300 days of sunshine annually, the area enjoys mild winters and although the summers are hot, like desert climates, the nights are cool.

Odessa, with a population of about 100,000 is principally blue collar, and Midland has about 75,000 population and is principally white collar. The entire economy is tied to oil production. Most of the residents reflect pioneer traditions, are independent and conservative. Traditionally, Midland has voted Republican and Odessa has voted Democrat except in Presidential elections when it has sometimes voted Republican.

The two towns have always competed and struggled over big and small matters, probably worse than Minneapolis-St. Paul and any two other twin cities. The chambers of commerce of the two cities agreed before legislation was enacted to locate the university midway between the cities. Later Odessans maneuvered to get it located in Odessa, and Midlanders were enraged; 15 years later that rage had not calmed. The two cities continually seek opportunities to best one another and the loser usually reciprocates. Since the Texas legislature has long been overwhelmingly controlled by the Democratic Party, Odessa usually wins battles that can be influenced politically but Midland, one

of the richest cities per capita in the U.S., often wins those that rely on wealth and influence among the wealthy.

Mission. The campus riots local citizens saw on television were mostly related to the Vietnam War but a major factor in the student protests of the late 1960s was students' criticisms of poor teaching. In many cases students enrolled in a university because of its distinguished faculty but found that most of their courses were taught by teaching assistants. And some of the faculty made clear that they did not care for teaching but did it so they could have a job in university research. The explosion of student enrollment from 3.6 million in 1960 to 8.6 million in 1970 contributed to much faculty mistreatment of students, and students resented it. The Ph.D., which is designed to train researchers, was criticized as one of the main culprits of poor undergraduate teaching.

The planners of UTPB decided early that special emphasis would be placed on teaching and care would be made to select individuals who had demonstrated talent for teaching or who showed promise in that direction.

CRITERIA

The initial staff worked alone for one year at the end of which one of the college deans and the library director arrived; another dean arrived six months later and the third at the end of

the second year. Deans were chosen who shared the same criteria as the planners regarding teaching and faculty.

The University opened in September 1973; hence, administrators had three years for planning and ample time to seek out the kind of faculty desired. The criteria that guided faculty recruitment and selection were arrived at after thorough deliberation and major effort was exerted in seeking out candidates who met those criteria. These were the major qualities sought in faculty.

1) Knowledge of discipline or field of expertise. This was never debated, the planners all accepted it as a given. Further, the planners agreed that there is wide variation in level of faculty competence depending, in part, on the quality of the graduate school in which the individual studied. While there are exceptions, faculty who receive the Ph.D. from the leading graduate schools were admitted to graduate study because they showed more promise than those entering less prestigious graduate schools, they were exposed to more intellectually sophisticated faculty and higher academic performance and achievement were expected of them. In brief, Ph.D. graduates of the leading research universities are more likely to be better trained in their disciplines and, hence, one way to ensure academic competence is by recruiting faculty who received the Ph.D. from those institutions. Another advantage of recruiting from the best

graduate schools is the values and attitudes toward research and scholarship of its graduates, about which more later.

How did they identify the institutions? The primary source was the American Council on Education survey in 1969 which produced lists of leading graduate programs in the arts and sciences and in engineering.[1] The ACE study ranked the top 10 universities in each discipline, then identified second and third groups, each unranked. The number of institutions in group two and group three varied by discipline from a half dozen to 35.

Special effort was made to select faculty who had received the Ph.D. degree from either group one or group two institutions. In fields not included in the ACE study, other sources were used. Several authorities were consulted about leading graduate schools of education and the list they supplied was later confirmed by a UCLA study of leading graduate schools of education, business and law.[2]

2) The second criterion was enthusiasm about one's discipline. The planners believed that an effective teacher is usually one who feels passionately about his discipline and reflects excitement

---

1 Roose, Kenneth D. and Charles J. Anderson, A Rating of Graduate Programs. Washington: American Council on Education, 1970.

2 Munson, C. Eric and Pat Nelson, "Measuring the Quality of Professional Schools," UCLA Educator, 19:3 (Spring 1977), pp. 42-53.

when he discusses it. This would be difficult to measure on an objective scale, but after interviewing several hundred candidates, the planners were able to determine it with some degree of accuracy. Faculty members under whom an individual had studied could usually give an assessment of this and if students and former students could be interviewed, they were excellent sources. Finally, experienced interviewers develop a kind of "sixth sense" that tells something about how a person feels about his discipline, not necessarily the global view of the field but when he begins to talk about specific areas or problems in the field, one's real interests, depth of feeling and commitment to study and learning more about the subject emerge.

3) The third criterion was similar to the second but different: one's enthusiasm for teaching. Did he find it to be enjoyable, did he look forward to the school year starting and to facing students in the classroom? How did he talk about interactions with students? What did he say to questions about teaching educationally deprived students and slow learners? How did he react to working with gifted students? Asking the candidate to explain how he dealt with a variety of teaching problems often revealed more indirectly about his worth as a potential teacher than a direct answer to the question.

Again, colleagues, students and former students were good sources of information about an individual's attitudes toward and approach to teaching. And, an experienced interviewer could learn

intuitively much about a candidate's enthusiasm about teaching. True, a candidate could fake enthusiasm in an interview enough to deceive an interviewer if he tried but no single source of information was used in evaluating the candidate on each criterion; if an interview contradicted other information, further information was sought. For example, a dean reported that the poorest interview he had was with a Ph.D. candidate from a leading university; he was dull, listless, uncommunicative, and showed no promise as a teacher. But other evidence pointed to his becoming a good teacher. Further checking with highly reliable sources convinced the dean and central administration to offer him a position. Only after he reported for duty did his dean learn that the candidate had the flu and a high fever on the day he was interviewed; he turned out to be a good teacher.

Enthusiasm for teaching does not mean that the individual is demonstrative and histrionic. Some are but some of the best teachers are quiet in manner but their enthusiasm is evident through their language and their classroom style — a kind of intellectual electricity that students find stimulating. Students know which teachers feel enthusiastic about teaching and about their discipline and these have direct impact on student interest in the subject, curiosity about it and desire to learn more about it. One only need to reflect on the number of professors who say they got into a particular field of study because of the

excitement and enthusiasm of one of their professors about his work.

4) The fourth criterion was empathy for students. How did the potential faculty member regard students? Were they simply numbers or did he have some understanding and sympathy for students who differ? Most teachers enjoy working with the top 10 percent — students who are eager, enthusiastic and capable of learning with only limited guidance from the instructor.

UTPB would be teaching students who transferred from junior colleges, many of them with poor academic preparation, some with low motivation and some with limited capacities for learning. Many would have been exposed to some teachers whose training and intellectual sophistication were modest. In the university some of those students would be exposed for the first time to a level of intellectual competence that was completely new to them and it would be a shock to some, requiring a period to adapt. That is what happened. Many students later said their main problem at UTPB was that the junior college they had attended was to a considerable extent a continuation of high school; the university, on the other hand, was a quantum leap in academic requirements and teachers' expectations of students. Knowing this to be likely, the planners sought faculty who understood this and would help students make the adjustment, who were sensitive to students' other problems and either knew how to deal with them or wanted to help the student figure out ways to deal with them. Since many of

the students would be minorities, especially Hispanics some of whom came from homes where intellectual curiosity was modest, they would need teachers who could empathize and help them overcome problems, but at the same time not require less learning of them than of other students.

Although faculty empathy for students with learning problems was important, a component of this criterion was the general ability of faculty to work with all students. Did the potential faculty member respect students, treat them as adults and not abuse his position? Did he like students, did he enjoy interacting with them? The planners were highly conscious of the fact that some faculty take advantage of their position to insult students, denigrate them and their talents, humiliate them before classmates and, in other ways, abuse their authority. They sought faculty who would be fair to students in making course assignments, in testing and examinations, in grading and in other ways. Faculty were sought who might later be characterized as demanding, requiring a high level of academic achievement but honest and fair with students. If a professor enjoys personal popularity with students, that is a plus, but it is more important that one be regarded as competent, helpful to students in learning and fair in the treatment of them.

5) The fifth criterion was academic standards. During the late 1960s grade inflation in colleges and universities was already rampant. The reasons are debateable. Some say it was due to

professors inflating grades to help young men avoid the draft and Vietnam. Others say it was due to special efforts by liberal professors to help minorities, many of whom came to universities with inadequate academic preparation. Others claim that it was a more general reaction of radical and liberal professors against the Vietnam War, racism, social and economic inequities, reaction to the assasination of President John F. Kennedy or anger with a society from which they were becoming increasingly alienated. Whatever the reasons, grade inflation was a fact.

The planners wanted to ensure that the UTPB faculty could be empathetic with students and at the same time not translate that empathy into requiring less learning. Could the prospective faculty member have empathy for a student from a disadvantaged background, including willingness to give him special tutoring or other help but at the same time not shave course requirements? This was based on the belief that faculty who reduce requirements for grades and degrees for disadvantaged students are, in fact, doing them a disservice for they are being sent out into the world of work without the training needed. Faculty were sought who were constantly seeking excellence in student performance. It was recognized that excellence can be attained easily in a college or university simply by failing and dismissing all of the unexcellent students. On the other hand, to give passing grades and degrees to students who have not measured up to reasonable academic standards cheats them. UTPB sought faculty who would demand

achievement of students, permit them to repeat courses as needed, work with them individually and, in other ways, help them to achieve high standards of performance.

This, too, is not an easy quality to determine, perhaps the most difficult of all of those sought but, like others, with enough effort querying the candidate's professsors, graduate school peers, colleagues, students and former students of candidates, plus the intuitive insight developed by experienced interviewers, it was possible to determine this quality, although not to perfection in every case.

6) The sixth criterion was a mixture of personal qualities, including ability to get along with colleagues and administrators, to work cooperatively with others to help to build a new university and make it a success. Although the aforementioned criteria were considered critical, the planners' experience and interviews with administrators in some 20 universities confirmed the fact that lack of effectiveness as teachers and, more generally, as faculty is more often due to personality deficiencies.

Outside academia, the lack of ability to work effectively with others is probably the single most important factor leading to dismissal of employees. And while senior faculty like to think that their tenure recommendations are based solely on teaching, research and service, a thorough analysis would probably show that inability to work effectively with others is a major factor in

one's failure to earn tenure. At the same time, such individuals are likely not to be very effective teachers. This criterion was applied with caution; there are exceptions of individuals whose peer relations are poor but whose teaching and research performance are good.

RECRUITING PROCEDURES

The identification of names of potential faculty, both new Ph.D.s and experienced faculty, was done in the conventional manner — advertising, writing to leading graduate departments, contacting leading scholars in the field, and reliance on friends and colleagues on other campuses.

A written nomination was usually followed by a telephone call to the nominator for further information and occasionally to others before contacting the nominee. The nominee was then invited to make application and submit a curriculum vitae. Deans, and later chairmen, were instructed to speak on the telephone with at least two of the references listed by the candidate and at least two or more other individuals who were acquainted with the individual's work.

Letters of recommendation were requested in a few cases but they were usually worthless. Virtually no one then nor today will give a candid assessment of an individual's qualifications in writing; thanks to open records laws, candidates can usually gain access to such letters and writers will not be candid. Even where

the candidate authorizes confidentiality of written recommendations, professors and others have no confidence in the confidentiality of such records and most refuse to write candid analyses of individuals' qualifications.

The planners, including later the deans and other administratiors when they arrived, found many references reluctant to be candid even on the telephone. Through followup conversations with others it became apparent that many references, both those named by the candidate and those chosen by UTPB officials, were withholding evidence that might be negative. The deans and Vice President for Academic Affairs met frequently to discuss candidates. Often one of them would have a personal friend or acquaintance on the candidate's campus who knew the candidate and would give a candid assessment of his qualifications or would talk with people who did know and respond by telephone with a more candid evaluation. Even with all of this effort, there were cases where conversations by UTPB officials with personal acquaintances who knew candidates well did not elicit critical information, resulting in some unwise appointments.

Frequently, administrators, and faculty after they had begun to arrive, traveled to campuses of candidates to talk with students, former students, colleagues and/or teachers of candidates. For two years before opening, the Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, an individual particularly skilled in human relations, perceptive and able to elicit more

information than most interviewers, spent much of his time traveling to universities to identify faculty candidates, interview others and gather recommendations and information about candidates on behalf of all deans and later chairmen (several chairmen arrived one year before the institution opened for students). Prior to the arrival of deans, the Vice President for Academic Affairs had begun to assemble lists of names and visited approximately 20 universities to identify others, interview candidates and collect evaluations plus visiting several national meetings of professional societies to interview candidates. The deans did the same after they arrived.

Finally, every finalist candidate was brought to the campus for an interview, including one who was on a Fullbright assignment in Germany. In most cases, their spouses also came. In the years before opening and when there were few individuals to interview candidates, there was ample time to spend with candidates for in-depth discussions during which it was possible to gain more insight than was possible after the institution was under way and candidates were interviewed by more groups and individuals, all for brief periods -- typical of what one finds on most campuses currently. Campus visits lasted two or three days and the candidates were seen in a number of situations, often including lunch with two or three local citizens. The candidate and spouse were exposed to the community in several ways so they could determine whether they would likely be happy there.

THE RESULTS

When the planners first arrived, they visited with faculty and administrators at the University of Texas at Austin who suggested that the institution not attempt to recruit from the leading doctoral programs, for two reasons. First, the town of Odessa had grown up during the oil boom of the 1950s and gained an unsavory reputation as a boom town, notwithstanding the fact that it subsequently developed an 80-piece symphony orchestra, had a replica of Shakespeare's Globe Theater that presented classical theater, had an annual guest concert series of touring musical performers, a little theater, ballet and several other cultural advantages. In fact, local citizens tended to overdo cultural development in an effort to overcome the town's traditional image. Nonetheless, its traditional image remained and UT-Austin faculty felt that image would cause faculty with several job options to avoid Odessa. Later, when UTPB administrators attempted to recruit new Ph.D.s from UT-Austin, it became apparent that the least qualified candidates were being nominated by the faculty, which led UTPB to terminate efforts to recruit new Ph.D.s from the UT-Austin campus. Several faculty who had received the Ph.D. degree from UT-Austin were subsequently recruited but none directly from graduate school; all had received their degrees some years earlier and were teaching at universities in other states.

The second reason UT-Austin faculty gave was that as a new institution, without an established research reputation, UTPB

could not attract capable faculty. In addition, the institution had announced plans for several innovations which the UT-Austin faculty felt would discourage potential faculty. Among these was "term tenure" (seven-year contracts).

Hence, most of the faculty recruiting was done at leading research universities out of state. Few of the prospective faculty members had heard of Odessa and its (un)cultured reputation and did not share the prejudice of longtime Texans toward the town; after they arrived, most found more cultural activity than the towns from which they had come. As for the innovations, including term tenure, they proved to be an asset in faculty recruitment, particularly among young Ph.D.s just finishing graduate school who were seeking an innovative institution. Many had been interviewed at universities with tenure quota systems in which their chances for being retained after the probationary period, regardless of their job performance, was poor.

The University was successful beyond the planners' expectations in attracting faculty who had been educated at leading research universities. For example, faculty in literature included Ph.D. degrees from Indiana University, UC-Berkeley, Yale (2), the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and the University of Illinois, among others. The faculty in life sciences included Ph.D.s from Cal Tech, Michigan, Northwestern, Oregon and similar institutions. The four faculty in history held

Ph.D. degrees from Brown, Northwestern, Wisconsin, and SUNY Stony Brook. Psychology faculty included Ph.D.s from Indiana, Texas, UCLA (2), and Duke. Education included faculty with doctorates from Indiana, Texas, Claremont, Syracuse, Colorado, Iowa, UCLA, Oregon State, and Washington State. A small engineering program attracted faculty with Ph.D. degrees from Purdue, UC-Berkeley, Ohio State, University of Pennsylvania, Iowa State and Colorado School of Mines, among others.

A small department of accounting had four faculty, three with doctorates representing Harvard, Texas A & M and Louisiana State. And geology included faculty with Ph.D. degrees from Rice, Colorado School of Mines, Texas, Rensselear, Iowa and Hawaii. These are typical of the faculty recruited either for the opening year or in the first few years after the university opened.

Teaching Performance. Recruitment of faculty from research universities was not the sole aim, as previously explained. Hundreds of faculty from such universities were interviewed but found wanting in one or more of the aforementioned criteria. As one administrator put it, if a leading reasearch university produces a dozen Ph.D.s in one discipline in a given year, five or some other number are likely to be potentially good teachers; it was the task of those involved in recruiting to identify those five.

The performance of the faculty as teachers far exceeded administrators' hopes. For the most part, faculty who chose to

The performance of the faculty as teachers far exceeded administrators' hopes. For the most part, faculty who chose to accept positions at UTPB were committed to teaching, liked it and did well. From the beginning, almost all of the faculty approached their teaching with enthusiasm and commitment, voluntarily teaching overloads to accomodate students, spending large amounts of time with students individually, tutoring those who came with deficiences and serving the mentor role fully.

Initially, a few prospective faculty expressed concern that a small, public institution in an isolated part of the state would be able to attract faculty from research universities with the kind of intellectual sophistication to which they had been accustomed. After the first few were appointed, individuals with good credentials from leading universities, this concern disappeared.

The faculty agreed before the University opened that student ratings of teaching should be obtained every semester. The ratings were so high that some administrators wondered if they were all honest. A different method of collecting the ratings was instituted and the high ratings did not change. For several years, administrators went to the student canteen and joined tables of students at random to discuss the University and teaching. With isolated exceptions, student comments about teaching were not simply positive but highly complimentary. Repeatedly, administrators heard students say, "These professors

know so much;" "she works very hard to help the student understand;" "she is very demanding but fair;" "he is always so well prepared;" "my professors are always available to students;" and many more. Student testimonials to the outstanding teaching, to the erudition of the faculty and to faculty treatment of students became commonplace.

The reward system was designed to reward good teaching. At first faculty were skeptical about this pronouncement but when it became apparent that there was a relationship between salary increases and teaching performance the skepticism waned. This is not to suggest that salary increases alone can bring about good teaching; on the contrary, it simply reinforces other factors. Immediately with the opening of the institution, all faculty and the senior faculty in particular, adopted a strong committment to teaching and this became a part of the ethos of the institution. As a body, the faculty was intolerant of a colleague who mistreated students, who gained a reputation for poor teaching practice or lack of concern about teaching.

The ethos about teaching was further reinforced with the addition of an annual faculty award for outstanding teaching. While only $1,000 in cash was awarded, the symbolic value was far more important. Students and faculty made nominations and for weeks before selection, students campaigned for faculty, which built excitement and prestige for the award. Fortunately, the

faculty committee making the selections was able to separate personal popularity from teaching competence in choosing winners.

To be sure, not all faculty were paragons. Despite laborious efforts and much success in recruiting faculty who met the aforementioned criteria, there were exceptions: a nationally prominent economist, columnist for a national newspaper, turned out to be an alcoholic; an associate professor (woman) whose raunchy language in the classroom continually elicited protests from students; a learning specialist whose idea of teaching was to humiliate and demean students in class; a Harvard Ph.D. who worked well with the top 10 percent of students but had only scorn for the less talented; and there were other cases of failures in recruitment. But for the most part, the faculty appointed were outstanding teachers and met the other criteria fully.

From the beginning, faculty evaluation committees and administrators terminated non-tenured faculty as soon as it became apparent that they were not effective teachers or did not fit that institution, usually within two or three years instead of waiting the maximum of six years. Many such terminations led to public conflict; some of those terminated sought the support of the local press. With three newspapers, three television stations and 16 radio stations serving the two towns, all looking for local news in an isolated area with only a limited amount of news, faculty terminations received ample airing.

The establishment of UTPB coincided with the explosion of investigative journalism. Most of the reporters came directly from journalism schools committed to investigative journalism and with a view to spending a short period in the Midland-Odessa area then moving on to larger markets. Every complaint by faculty, students, local citizens and others was investigated thoroughly and reported amply, often with many inaccuracies, reflecting the reporters' youth, inexperience and distrust of persons in positions of responsibility.

Town-Gown Relations. The planners of UTPB were somewhat apprehensive about town-gown relations prior to the arrival of faculty, but faculty got along surprisingly well with the town. Among the faculty was the usual diversity of religion found in most state universities from fundamentalist Christians to Muslins, Jews, Unitarians and atheists. Odessa has more than 160 churches, many of fundamentalist persuasion. Although the potential for conflict based on religion was not discussed with faculty they apparently sensed the potential for conflict and avoided arguments with local citizens about religion. At any rate, the matter never became an issue, at least publicly.

Despite a few junior college faculty references to UTPB faculty as Yankees, the townspeople generally never seemed conscious of the faculty's origins or were not concerned about it. This was, perhaps, helped considerably by the fact that Odessa and Midland are populated with many geologists, engineers and others

associated with the oil industry who migrated there from outside Texas and the South.

In addition, most faculty became involved in the cultural life of the community, acting in the little theater, serving on various boards of cultural activities, performing in the local symphony orchestra and serving on a wide range of committees. Several faculty joined Rotary, the Lions Club and other service clubs, which contributed to good town-gown relations.

The University administration encouraged faculty to participate in civic activities but pressured no one to do so. Fortunately, most faculty voluntarily chose to do so.

Faculty Motivations. Both faculty and administrators, formally and informally, sought over the years following the opening of the university to determine what attracted faculty to UTPB. Most of the reasons were predictable. The attraction of a new university and the excitement that surrounds the establishment of a new institution was a major factor. The upper level model initially sounded like an excellent idea but most faculty and administrators eventually decided it was not a valid concept.[3]

The opportunity to plan a curriculum without the problems of institutional traditions and limitations was attractive to both

3 For an assessment of the upper level model, see : V. R. Cardozier, "The Upper level College: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow," The Educational Record, 65:3 (Summer 1984), pp. 30-35.

new and experienced faculty. The opportunity for young faculty to teach courses of their choosing was a significant attractant. Several faculty — particularly in the humanities and social sciences — said they had interviewed at large universities where they could not expect to be able to choose the courses they would teach until they gained considerable seniority, perhaps several years.

Although the area possesses little physical beauty and only a few of the faculty considered the location a plus, most did not find it to be a negative factor. Unaware of the image of the town before arriving, few developed the prejudice toward the boom town image articulated by UT-Austin faculty.

One of the major attractions, especially for young faculty, was the institution's policy concerning research and publication.

RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION

The planners of the University had served in several research universities and were acutely aware of the toll on effective teaching that the publish or perish policy exacts, in the cases of some faculty. They were also aware of the fact that, except for research universities, most faculty do not publish much. Later, a national study found that in comprehensive colleges and universities, which UTPB was to become, 25 percent of the faculty had published nothing and another 40 percent had published

little.[4] At the same time the publish or perish policy causes many faculty to spend a great deal of time trying to do enough research and publication, however inconsequential, to earn tenure and promotion. The UTPB planners feared this would seriously detract from the teaching mission envisioned.

The planners also believed that the lack of research and publication in comprehensive colleges and universities is due to the fact that many of their faculty have been trained in institutions where a commitment to research is not acquired. The planners believed that Ph.D. students in leading research universities acquire an attitude toward research, an inquiring attitude toward their disciplines that does not obtain to the same degree in lesser institutions, that in the leading research universities students are socialized into their disciplines or fields of study which includes adoption of the research ethos of the faculty there.

As explained earlier, the planners had decided to recruit faculty from the leading research universities, primarily to help ensure knowledge of their disciplines and competence as teachers. At the same time, individuals trained in leading research

4 Everett Carll Ladd, Jr. "The Work Experience of American College Professors: Some Data and an Argument." Current Issues in Higher Education, American Association for Higher Education, Washington D.C., 1979.

universities would have acquired a commitment to research such that a publish or perish requirement would be unnecessary; they would engage in research without such a requirement. The planners decided that by recruiting the type of faculty described, a publish or perish policy would not be necessary and in fact would very likely impair teaching. Instead, a policy was established giving the faculty member the option of deciding whether to be evaluated on research and publication along with teaching and service or on the latter two only. If one chose the research option, his teaching load was reduced and when performance was reviewed, faculty committees and administrators considered research and publication. If the research option was not selected, it was initially not considered; after some experience, faculty committees decided to accept evidence of research and publication to support a faculty member's evaluation but if one had not chosen the research option, absence of any evidence of publication in one's professional file did not penalize him.

Approximately one-fourth of the faculty chose the research option and reduced teaching load. Later, it became apparent that some of those who had not chosen the research option were about as productive in publishing as those who had. Their explanation substantiated the planners' prediction. They were doing research and publishing but did not choose the research option and carried a fulltime teaching load by choice because they wanted to be free

of the threat of penalty for lack of publication. Even though they did publish, many of them prolifically, they preferred the absence of threat. This freed them to devote as much time as they needed to developing their courses and to teaching.

Four years after opening, a survey was conducted to determine the nature and extent of scholarly activity of faculty during the previous five-year period at the university (since a few faculty chairmen had arrived one year before the university opened). The survey showed that more than half of the faculty had published one or more journal articles, an average of 3.8 articles per faculty member; about one-third had authored or co-authored books or contributed chapters to books; almost one-half had presented papers at professional or scholarly meetings, an average of 4.2 papers per faculty member. In addition, fine arts faculty who did not publish had created or presented artistic performances such as music recitals, dance performances, art shows and theatrical presentations that are usually considered in those fields comparable to scholarly activity.

The least amount of publication was among business administration faculty; however, most of them were involved in consulting with local businesses and industries which, they argued, provided a wealth of material to bring back to the classroom and which made greater contributions than some research. The next lowest rate of publication was among the education faculty, most of whom were involved in working with school

districts, some on a consulting-for-fee basis but most of them on a gratis basis.

Following the survey, members of the central administration and the deans visited informally with faculty chairmen and senior faculty to assess the experiment. The conclusion of all concerned was that the research option was a decided success, that it had probably resulted in about as much research and publication as would have occurred under a publish or perish policy, and that the absence of threat contributed in a major way to teaching.

IMPLICATIONS

This account of the recruitment and selection of faculty in one institution and the outcomes cannot be generalized completely. Some of the conditions were unique and others were unusual. It was a new institution which made possible certain procedures that are difficult to employ in an established institution.

Since faculty selection is the single most important element in developing effective teaching in a college or university, it behooves institutions to expend major effort on this task. During the 1960s when college and university enrollments were growing rapidly and there was a shortage of highly qualified faculty, administrators and senior faculty involved in the recruitment of new faculty members became less discriminating, albeit not by choice. Now that there is an ample supply of talented and qualified faculty in most disciplines, it is essential that the recruitment and selection process be as thorough as possible.